

## Butte-Silver Bow Study Commission Minutes

**Meeting Date:** February 3, 2005

**Time:** 5:30 p.m.

**Place:** Butte-Silver Bow County Courthouse, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Conference Room

**Call to Order:** Chairman Bob Worley brought the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Chairman Worley proceeded to call roll with the following results:

**Members Present:** Wayne Harper, Dave Palmer, Meg Sharp, Cindi Shaw, Northey Tretheway, Bob Worley, and Shag Miller. Ron Rowling and Shelly Jones were also present.

**Excused Absence:** Ristene Hall

**Unexcused Absence:** Tony Bonney

**Others Present:** No one else attended the meeting.

**Approval of Minutes:** Chairman Worley requested approval of the January 27, 2005, minutes. A motion was made by Shag Miller to approve the minutes as submitted by the secretary of the meeting; Wayne Harper seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Citizens Comments:** N/A

**Items Not Addressed on the Agenda:** Chairman Worley asked the commission members their thoughts about how the minutes should be transcribed from the workshop that was held on Wednesday, February 2, 2005, with Ken Weaver and his secretary. Dave Palmer suggested the minutes be done just like the regular meeting minutes since the tapes are available if any questions arise.

Chairman Worley asked if anyone had anything to add that was not addressed on the agenda. Cindi Shaw reported that she would be gone for the next three weeks. She will be checking her email for messages and keeping apprised of the meeting by looking up the minutes on the website. Dave Palmer reported he will not be present on February 17, 2005. Wayne Harper will not be present at next Thursday's meeting, February 10, 2005. It was discussed that Bob Worley will go over the schedule and that the schedule for the speakers may need to be rearranged.

**Agenda Item No. 1:** The plan for tonight's meeting was to review and consolidate the information from the last three weeks. Chairman Worley suggested they start off by reviewing Judy Jacobson's comments and then reviewing the other speakers that have come before the Study Commission. Chairman Worley asked for comments. Wayne Harper commented that, in essence, the information would be "taking the 'wheat from the shaft'." He suggested that the Study Commission focus on the things that the Commission is charged with. Northey Tretheway said one common point made among speakers and guests was the number of commissioners. It was decided that the highlights would be pulled from the speakers' comments and the Commission would focus on the things that something can be done about. Another point was, should the sheriff position be an elected position or an appointed director of police services. Cindi Shaw asked the Chairman if they could restate what the Study Commission can or cannot do. "Are we strictly looking at the running of the local

government?" She wants to be clear. Discussion continued on what should be looked at and what should be "tackled."

Dave Palmer said that the survey questions covered most everything that was brought up, so far, by the elected officials. He tried to cover everything. Regarding the report to the citizens, etc., he suggested that the report could be a report card that grades all the departments. Discussion pursued about the detail of the survey. The survey should reflect the feelings of the citizens. Wayne Harper reiterated Dave Palmer's comment that the SC is studying the entire government, and non-charter issues are something to inform on. Shag Miller asked for clarification on how many officials or department heads would speak before the survey was finalized.

Dialogue continued regarding the Charter, language in the Charter, i.e., shall/may, elected/appointed, etc. The conversation also included the pending lawsuits that would affect how decisions would be made. The questions came up, should commissioners run at large or as they are (in districts)? Educating the citizens is very important. The Study Commission would vote and the majority would prevail, but that minority reports can be written. The Commission also discussed that even though the Study Commission might think something is a good idea, the citizens might think otherwise. The community will be guiding the Commission. This is a two-fold effort, the Commission will go out and study other governments, and the Commission will encourage as much public opinion as possible. The question was asked if an audit would be done to determine the costs of the recommendations that would be made.

Bob Worley asked the Commission how they wanted to proceed with this evening's meeting. Northey Tretheway suggested that they have a core of questions for the survey. Dave Palmer suggested that the survey questions be reviewed.

The language, the format, and the interpretation of each question on the survey were discussed at great length. The discussion included such things as the implications of hiring a city manager versus an elected chief executive. City managers that are hired may leave at the drop of a hat for a better salary. Also, language in the charter would have to be reviewed when considering the wage of a city manager, because the Charter sets the parameters for employees reporting to the city manager/chief executive. A question came up regarding the sheriff position. Should that position be an administrator or a law enforcement officer? Should the position be elected or appointed? Comparisons were made to the current director of fire services. Right now any one running for some of the elected positions may or may not have the qualifications or education to do the job. The question was raised why is the sheriff position an elected position and the fire chief position is appointed. As you advance through the fire department and the police department you have to pass certain tests. The police commission is a paid board (minimal), and the fire commission is not. Having a community (enrichment) clean-up board and a community enrichment coordinator and what that position would entail was talked about for quite awhile. This position would handle Superfund issues (all issues). The non-existence of enforcing ordinances was discussed. Perhaps, the enrichment coordinator/facilitator (an all encompassing position) would ensure enforcement. Parameters would be set for the job description. Should it be put in the Charter or be appointed by the Chief Executive?

It was decided that the survey questions should be straightforward. Ken Weaver will review the questions on the survey before it is finalized. Chairman Worley asked Dave Palmer if it was decided if this was going to be a phone survey or written survey. Dave Palmer said that it would be a phone survey if the details can be worked out. The survey will be a random survey. Particulars of how the survey would be conducted were reviewed.

Chairman Worley asked if anyone had any other questions they would like added to the survey. Meg Sharp brought to everyone's attention the issue that was raised by numerous people regarding the number of complaints that the Chief Executive's Office, the Council of Commissioners, the department heads, etc. Could the community use a centralized complaint department (an ombudsman)? One person could handle all complaints for follow-up. Judy Jacobson and others brought it up. The departments need to work more cohesively. A police officer or city/county worker driving by a leak or by a stray dog(s) or by garbage could either report it or pick up the garbage, for example. Educate the employees. This question of adding a complaint department will be added to the survey.

Shag Miller asked if questions should be on the survey that asked the citizens their thoughts on how well they think different departments are doing. This would allow a report card to be communicated to the community. Shag also brought up the idea of asking the question on the survey of whether or not the Water Department should be split from Public Works Department. Research would need to be done before this decision was made. It is very complicated. A lot of cross billing is done because of sharing staff, e.g., an architect.

Dave Palmer will revise the survey questions and add the new questions. Information will be put in the paper to notify the public that the survey will be taking place. The survey might be issued sometime in June.

Next weeks speakers will be Lori Maloney, Jeff Miller, and Dan Fisher. The week after that, February 17, the law enforcement and the courts will be invited to speak (John Walsh, Jerome McCarthy, Steve Kambich, Debbie Darragh, and Bob Lee.) On February 24, Pat Callahan, Danette Gleason, Linda Sajor-Joyce will speak, and maybe Paul Babb if he is available. Dave Palmer suggested that maybe previous study commission members could be invited to speak (Jim Fabatz, Dr. Dan O'Neill, Rick Griffith, Jean Rupert, etc.) Cindi Shaw asked that Ellen Crane be added as a speaker.

The deadline to have everything done for the general election is August 10, 2006. Northey Tretheway prepared a calendar for the Study Commission. Northey will try to send it to Shelly to either email or print for everyone (3-hole punched). Dave Palmer asked if the survey for the employees could be sent with employees' checks. Per Chairman Worley, Ron Rowling brought up a suggestion that a lot of employees do not pick up their check stubs in a timely fashion. It may be better to give the survey to the department heads.

***Date for Next Meeting:*** The next meeting will be Thursday, February 10, 2005.

***Adjourn:*** Chairman Worley entertained a motion to adjourn. Northey seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.